

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-40 are pending in the present application, with claims 1, 11, 14, 24, 27 and 37 being the independent claims. No claims are amended and no new matter has been added.

In the Final Rejection dated June 6, 2007, claims 1-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,822,435 issued to Boebert et al. The outstanding rejections to the claims are respectfully traversed.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge that the Examiner has indicated that the drawings are accepted.

#### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102**

In the Final Rejection, claims 1-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,822,435 issued to Boebert et al. (hereinafter referred to as “Boebert”.) Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The subject matter of independent claims 1 and 14 includes the feature of “determining, based on said user input, whether said user input is intended for said secured execution environment”. This feature is neither disclosed nor anticipated by the prior art. Page 4 of the Final Rejection asserts that Boebert column 9, lines 53-65, column 5, line 27, and column 6, lines 26-29 disclose determining, based on said user input, whether said user input is intended for said secured execution environment. Applicants respectfully disagree. In Boebert, the determination on whether the secured path mode is used is performed manually as an additional step by the user. Boebert recites:

Trusted path mode can be invoked in a number of ways. In one embodiment, a switch on trusted path subsystem 30 can be used to manually activate trusted path mode. A second method would be to invoke trusted path mode by a combination of keys pressed simultaneously on keyboard 20 (like the control/alt/delete key sequence on a PC-compatible computer). A third embodiment would require that the user insert some sort of token device into subsystem 30. A token device might range from a smart card to a cryptoignition key. In the preferred embodiment, subsystem 30 would also have a feedback mechanism such as a light to notify

the user that subsystem 30 was in trusted path mode. (*Boebert, column 5, lines 66-77 column 6, lines 1-10*)

As can be seen from this excerpt, Boebert requires manual intervention, through additional user input or activities, to invoke trusted path mode. The examples provided by Boebert include selecting a specific combination of keys on the keyboard, inserting a token device into the trusted path subsystem, and manually activating a switch in the trusted path subsystem. These are all additional, manual steps that the user must perform beyond entering user data.

Boebert does not use user input to determine whether trusted path mode should be used. In contradistinction to claims 1 and 14, as can be seen from the excerpt above, Boebert requires a separate action, or step, on behalf of the user solely for the purpose of dictating to Boebert's system whether the trusted path mode should be used. Claims 1 and 14 disclose "determining, based on said user input, whether said user input is intended for said secured execution environment". Claims 1 and 14 do not require additional user steps separate from the entering of user data to determine whether the user input is intended for a secured execution environment, as taught in Boebert. The Office Action appears to be equating Boebert's required additional, manual user actions for selecting trusted path mode with the user input of the claimed subject matter. The user input of claims 1 and 14 is not the manual user activity required of Boebert. Therefore, Boebert does not disclose or anticipate "determining, based on said user input, whether said user input is intended for said secured execution environment".

Applicants respectfully submit that Boebert does not disclose or anticipate all the elements of claims 1 and 14 or claims depending therefrom, including claims 2-10 and 15 -23. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the §102(b) rejection of claims 1-10 and 14-23.

Claim 27 is rejected on substantially the same grounds as claims 1 and 14. Therefore, the arguments set forth above also apply to claim 27. Applicants respectfully submit that Boebert does not disclose or anticipate all the elements of claim 27 or claims depending therefrom, including claims 28-36. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the §102(b) rejection of claims 27-36.

The subject matter of independent claims 11 and 24 includes the feature of “accepting output from a specific source entity in a secured execution environment; and securely transferring the output to an output device”. This feature is neither disclosed or anticipated in the prior art. The Final Rejection, on page 6, alleges that Boebert column 8, lines 45-50 and 57-63, and column 9 lines 53-65 discloses accepting output from a specific source entity in said secured execution environment and securely transferring said output to an output device. The Final Rejection asserts that in Boebert’s secure mode, an output is transferred and stored in a video RAM, which is not used in normal mode, and output and displayed on a trusted window is teaching securely transferring said output to an output device as claimed in claims 11 and 24. Applicants respectfully disagree.

In Boebert, the output originates on a device that is security neutral in that it is neither secured nor unsecured in itself. The output of the device is manipulated based on the mode, which determines the security of the transfer of output. The device is entirely capable of sending unsecured output as well as secured output. If Boebert’s system is in secured mode, the output is stored in an intermediary component, the video RAM. If it is not in secured mode, it is not diverted to the intermediary video RAM. (Boebert, column 8, lines 57-63.) This is a diversion of the output based on the security mode of the system. This is not the same as “accepting output from a **specific source entity in said secured execution environment**; and securely transferring said output to an output device”. Boebert’s output source is the same source whether Boebert’s system is functioning in secured mode or not. The source is not a specific source entity within a secured execution environment. Therefore, Boebert does not disclose or anticipate accepting output from a specific source entity in said secured execution environment and securely transferring said output to an output device.

Applicants submit that Boebert does not disclose or anticipate all the elements of claims 11 and 24 or claims depending therefrom, including claims 12-13 and 25-26. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the §102(b) rejection of claims 11-13 and 24-26.

**DOCKET NO.:** MSFT-2817/301134.01  
**Application No.:** 10/693,407  
**Office Action Dated:** June 6, 2007

**PATENT  
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED  
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO  
37 CFR § 1.116**

Claim 37 is rejected on substantially the same basis as claims 11 and 24. Therefore, the arguments set forth above in regards to claims 11 and 24 also apply to claim 37. Applicants respectfully submit that Boebert does not disclose or anticipate all the elements of claim 37 or claims depending therefrom, including claims 38-40. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the §102(b) rejection of claims 37-40.

Applicants acknowledge that the Office Action establishes additional grounds for rejection of the claims that are dependent upon claims 1, 11, 14, 24, 27 and 37. However, in view of the traversals set forth with respect to the independent claims, Applicants believe that all such dependent claims are in condition for allowance, rendering the rejections of those claims moot. Applicants believe that this response completely and accurately addresses all grounds of rejection. Applicants reserve the right to challenge the rejection of any of those dependent claims in any future response that may be forthcoming.

**DOCKET NO.:** MSFT-2817/301134.01  
**Application No.:** 10/693,407  
**Office Action Dated:** June 6, 2007

**PATENT  
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED  
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO  
37 CFR § 1.116**

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that this application, including claims 1-40, is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 3, 2007

/Aaron F. Bourgeois/  
Aaron F. Bourgeois  
Registration No. 57,936

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
Cira Centre  
2929 Arch Street, 12<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Philadelphia PA 19104-2891  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439